THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVIII JULY, 1945 No. 301

High Churchmen and High Statesmen

IN 1835 John Keble preached a university sermon on Church and State.[1] The occasion was the anniversary of the accession of King William IV, and Keble took as his text Isaiah xlix, 23: *Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers.* A few years later he contributed a long article on the same subject to *The British Critic* (October, 1839). He was what I call a high churchman and a high statesman. He held an exalted conception both of the nature and task of the Church and of the nature and task of the State—exalted, that is, in comparison with other conceptions that were current then and are current now. It may be worth while to consider the salient points in the position he marked out, and to inquire whether we can or ought to try to occupy that position today and whether there are elements of the matter which he left out of account but with which we must reckon.

To begin with his text. The words in Isaiah are addressed to Sion, which traditional exegesis has taken to be a figure of the Church of Christ. Keble could claim that "all, or nearly all, who receive the holy Scriptures" were agreed in interpreting this passage of the case of the Christian Church since the time of Constantine. But it had been interpreted in diverse ways. If the words of the text were taken by themselves, they could be taken to mean that the Church was committed by Divine Providence to the care of the State, as a child to the care of its nurse, and therefore depended mainly on State support, and could hardly exist, certainly not flourish, were that support withdrawn.

But Keble rightly pointed out that this interpretation is not justified if the text is considered in its context. The promise is not that Sion or the Church shall be handed over to the powers of this world. The promise is that the sovereigns of earth shall act as nurses or guardians of the Church's children. Kings will serve the Church, not the Church be kept by kings. It is not the Church that is to be cared for and supported by the State, but the Church's children. Moffatt's translation is therefore to be preferred: *Kings shall be their guardians; queens shall nurse them for you* (*i.e.*, shall nurse your children for you).

However, Keble knew that he must not base his teaching on a single text. He chose this text because the two interpretations of it were significant of two contrasted views of the relation between Church and State in England. On the one hand, there were those who held that the task of the State was, in itself, the purely temporal or secular one of maintaining order and of preserving life and property. It was under no moral obligation to concern itself with religion or morality; but, because the diffusion of religion and morality was a useful asset

[1] *Sermons, Academical and Occasional* (1847), pp. 149-72.

to the State in performing its primary task, it had done well in England to make an alliance with the Church of England and to support the Church. This view was easily combined with an Erastian or semi-Erastian view of the Church, the Church of England being regarded as a dependant of the State or as a voluntary society within the State. This I call a low view of both Church and State; it runs from Locke to Macaulay and Sir William Harcourt, and is still widely, though more vaguely, held.

On the other hand, there were those in the tradition of Hooker whose thought was determined by their view of the Church as a supernatural society. To them, the Church was the mystical body of Jesus Christ, through which He continued to be present and active in the world. The Church was His Spouse and the Mother of His family. All authority in heaven and on earth had been given to Him. The Church was sent to evangelize and baptize all nations and to build them up in the faith. When a nation was incorporated in the Church, its rulers were to act as guardians of the Church's children. On this view the proper task of the State was by no means confined to providing for man's temporal welfare; it was morally bound to acknowledge the truth of the Christian revelation and to assist the Church in providing for man's spiritual welfare. "Both Church and State," says Keble, "are (though in several ways) of divine appointment; . . . kings as well as bishops are in a manner representatives of Jesus Christ on earth."

But if we are to discover the right relation between Church and State today, we must look not only at the faith, to which Holy Scripture bears witness, but also at the present condition of the world. As regards Holy Scripture, the deduction of doctrine is handicapped in this instance by the circumstances that in the Old Testament Church and State were one society (which they are not now), and in the New Testament the question of establishing formal relations between Church and State had not arisen and was not contemplated as likely to arise. Nevertheless, the New Testament points to a high conception of the office of the State. Even heathen rulers are "powers ordained by God"; earthly governors, though not Christians, are ministers of God to the Christians for good.

It was the logic of this doctrine, as well as the logic of historic development, that when States and their rulers became Christian they should be regarded as guardians of the Church's children, and as bound to serve the Church's interests. To the divines of the middle ages and of the Reformation this seemed quite plain, since for them Church and State were again one society, and they could plausibly apply the teaching of the Old Testament concerning Israel to the *corpus christianum*. But by Keble's time it had long been evident that, whatever the ideal might be, Church and State in England were not in fact one society, and that new occasions were teaching new duties.

Herbert Thorndike, the learned seventeenth-century divine, opened his discourse on *The Right of the Church in a Christian State* with this sentence: "It is visible to all understandings that there are two states of God's Church; for there must needs be a great difference between the Church, as it was first established, by the ordinances of the Apostles, before the exercise of Christianity was allowed or privileged by the laws

of the Roman Empire; and as it now standeth, protected by the laws of Christian kingdoms and commonwealths." By the nineteenth century it was becoming visible to some understandings that there was to be a third state of God's Church in the world. There was the case of the Church in the pre-Christian State; there was the case of the Church in the Christian State; and there was to be the case of the Church in the post-Christian State. I use the term "post-Christian," but I do not want to suggest that we all, or any of us, know exactly what it means. It is in fact a question-begging term. But it is well to use it, even if it signifies no more than *x*, in order to protest against the notion that the third case of the Church is the same as the first.

People talk glibly about England's being now a pagan country and about the Church's task being that of a missionary movement. But these labour-saving statements darken counsel. In the case of an individual, there is a difference between a man who has never been a Christian and one who has lapsed or become apostate; and, though the analogy must not be pressed, there is a corresponding difference in the case of nations or states. In the case of an individual, there are many possible degrees of departure from allegiance to the Church; so there are in the case of states. But whereas the allegiance of an individual may have been little more than formal and without apparent consequences in the remainder of his life, a nation, which has been Christian for centuries, when it begins to depart from strict allegiance to the Church, will bear in its tradition and culture and institutions ineradicable marks of its Christian profession. We should expect, then, that it may be very difficult to say at what point it ceases to be Christian, and in fact as we consider the case of England today it is notoriously difficult to sum up or to pronounce a verdict.

There are, as I have said, those who declare glibly that England is now a pagan country. On the other side, we have *The Tablet*, which recently declared that "Great Britain and the United States are, despite loud voices to deny it, Christian States, which have always until now recognized, even when they have not obeyed, the voice of Christian conscience" (April 28, 1945). I should say that the voices on both sides are shrill rather than loud, and neither is convincing.

Keble was discerning and far-sighted enough to perceive that the process of England's departure from strict allegiance to the Church was already gathering momentum, was likely to advance much farther, and might entail the Church's separation from the State. Indeed, he and his contemporaries would be much surprised if they could see how little the overt or formal relations between Church and State have changed during the past century. "If anyone had told me," exclaimed T. A. Lacey towards the end of his life, referring to this subject, "if anyone had told me, (when I was) a young priest fifty years ago, that another half-century would leave us pretty much where we then were, I should have asked him what he thought we were made of."[1]

The question what we are made of, grave and searching as it is, is not the only question, and perhaps not the prior question. There is also the

[1] *Essays in Positive Theology* (1931), p. 213.

question what we are to make of, how we are to interpret, the signs of the times and to read our duty from them. Churchmen, the more conscious they are that the powers of the State are ordained by God that they may serve the eternal, as well as the temporal, welfare of His people, will be reluctant to force or hasten the State's departure from the Church or the disestablishment of the State.[1] On the other hand, statesmen seem to have no mind to bring matters to a head or to relieve sensitive and cautious churchmen of their predicament.

Actually, the predicament is more acute than Keble foresaw, and fresh complications have arisen. He anticipated that the State might become more and more hostile to the Church; he thought that the State might seek to impose upon the Church abandonment of essential articles of the faith as a condition of maintaining the alliance. In that event the Church's course would be clear. But he could not foresee that statesmen would be at least as benevolent to the Church in 1940 as they were in 1840. He could not foresee that within a century the novel doctrine that the State need not concern itself with religion and morality would have been tested and found wanting. Nor could he foresee the complications that would arise from the introduction of a compulsory system of national education. The State is now caring for the Church's children on a more ambitious and generous scale than was dreamed of a hundred years ago. Finally, he could not foresee that, as a result of the development of technics, States would become the bearers or organs of such power as was never at the disposal of the greatest tyrants in the past. In England we are thankful that this power has not yet been abused as it has been elsewhere, but the fact that it is now there, to be used or abused, should make us ask whether the nature of the State has not undergone a change which requires that all former political doctrines shall be reviewed and revised.

Until our own times, the maintenance of civil order has been a difficult and hazardous undertaking, especially in times of unsettlement and revolution; but now, for governors who know how to use the technical resources at their disposal, it is comparatively easy, indeed all too easy. The traditional emphasis on the duty of obedience, which was called for by earlier conditions, now needs to be qualified or supplemented. Tyranny is no doubt, as our forefathers were fond of saying, better than anarchy. But it is tyranny, not anarchy, that will be our peril in future. It is time to discard the doctrine of passive resistance to evil rulers, which was still dear to Keble. The Church at all events should train her members to be critical and suspicious of the powers that be, and active in resisting them when they transgress. This need not involve a denial that they are ordained by God; it is only to say that God has also ordained citizens to keep rulers in their place. In other words, high statesmen in future must hold an exalted conception of the office of subjects as well as of rulers.

[1] Cp. Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, *Twelve Addresses delivered at his Visitation* (1873), p. 171: "Many persons speak now of *disestablishing the Church*. But, let me ask, is there no such thing as *disestablishing the State?* . . . If a nation abandons her religious foundations, she *disestablishes herself*. If she abdicates her highest function, and forfeits her noblest privilege—that of promoting God's glory and of maintaining His truth—she *disendows herself*."

Likewise, I should say that high churchmen, though the cases are not quite parallel, ought to supplement their just emphasis on the obedience due to apostolic authority in the Church, with a corresponding emphasis on the responsibility of all church members not only *to*, but *for*, the government of the Church. May it not be that the inferior clergy, and laymen too, are ordained to keep prelates in their place, just as prelates are ordained and have attempted, though without much success, to keep popes in their place?

When, however, it has been granted that high statesmanship must be guarded against playing into the hands of tyranny, and high churchmanship against playing into the hands of clericalism, the question remains: What is the right, or divinely ordained, relation between the power of the State and the authority of the Church?

All who confess the divine ordering of the world will acknowledge that it is the office of the State to serve man's temporal welfare. But how are we to judge whether it is doing so aright? Is there a Natural Law which to this end it is bound to obey? Is it bound to obey the commandments of God, when they are made known, the commandments of the first as well as of the second table? High churchmen, like Keble, tended to be so preoccupied with the duty of the State to the Church that they did not give enough attention to the State's duty to God to establish economic and social justice. The deficiencies of the Tractarians in this respect are well known, and they were subsequently to a considerable extent remedied. But it does not suffice to define some abstract or ideal scheme of social justice. This may have little bearing on what is at present possible, and when men see that the State does not and cannot conform to prescribed standards they are liable to detach themselves from political action and to indulge in irresponsible criticism or to offer only doctrinaire counsel. "No politician," said Burke, "can make a situation. His skill consists in his well playing the game dealt to him by fortune, and following the indications given him by nature, times, and circumstances."[1]

The Whig or *laissez faire* doctrine as to the State's office in serving man's temporal welfare is now manifestly insufficient. Macaulay said:

> Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the nation by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties, by leaving capital to find its most lucrative source, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment, by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the state. Let the Government do this: the people will assuredly do the rest.[2]

That, I say, is manifestly an insufficient account of the State's duty in regard to man's temporal welfare. But it is also becoming manifest again that states may not regard the moral and religious training, or the eternal destiny, of their citizens as a matter of indifference.

Kings or their modern counterparts still have the duty of acting as guardians of the Church's children. They have, in fact, undertaken the

[1] *Correspondence of Edmund Burke* (1844), iv. 154.
[2] *Critical and Historical Essays*[2] (1843), i. 269.

duty of guarding and nursing all the children within their dominions in a manner that was not within the power of earlier ages. (By children here are not, of course, meant only children in years.) There are, however, two circumstances which make it impossible for the State at present or in any calculable future to conform to the relation between Church and State which Keble held to be divinely ordained. It is impossible for the State to recognize the exclusive authority of the Church of England or to give it exclusive support. His Majesty the King is no doubt a most faithful member of the Church of England, but we cannot now equate the State with the Monarch. Neither membership in the Legislature nor the franchise bears any relation to church membership or to Christian faith, and it is the considered resolve of the nation that this should be so. This alone makes it impossible for the State to acknowledge that the Church of England alone has been entrusted by God with responsibility for the moral and spiritual welfare of its citizens or to support the Church in discharging that responsibility.

But there is also a second disabling circumstance. What absence of faith on the part of the State would anyhow entail is made doubly inevitable by absence of unity on the part of the Church. Even if the English people were a nation of believers, there is no single ecclesiastical organization which the State can be expected to recognize as appointed by God to fulfil the task of the Church. We can no longer pretend that the Church *of* England is synonymous with the Church *in* England. We cannot simply deny that those whom Keble described as the Romish and Protestant dissenters have been entrusted by God with any task under the Gospel. High churchmen will rightly affirm that there is only one Church in England, since there is only one Church in the world; and the claim of the Church of England to be the Church of the whole English people, and not one among a number of Churches in England, witnesses to this truth. It would seem to be more accurate to regard the Romish and Protestant dissenters as separated members of the one Church in England than as other Churches. Meanwhile, so long as this condition of separation remains the State cannot be called upon to give exclusive support to the Church of England, and the establishment of normal relations between Church and State will be impossible.

Whatever is done will be anomalous, inconsistent and open to objection; but it is not the State that should be blamed, but the Christians for their disunity. In education, for example, the State can either support a number of ecclesiastical bodies, though in doing so it is supporting error, since they stand for doctrines that are in greater or less degree contradictory, and some of them must therefore be false; or it can agree to support in the schools that it provides a form of teaching which is acceptable not only to all ecclesiastical bodies but to the people as a whole, if such a form can be devised. In point of fact the State is now doing both these things. The objection to the latter—which is the support of what is called "undenominational Christianity"—is that it gives the impression that Christianity can be abstracted from the life and worship of the Church, and that in trying to satisfy everybody it may end in satisfying nobody.

I cannot but think that it would be better if the State professed to support in the schools that it provides not any form of Christianity but the inculcation of the Law of Nature. For it can reasonably be claimed that the English nation still recognizes, though incompletely and none too surely, the authority of the Law of Nature, even if it does not know it by that name, while it is even more certain that the English nation does not recognize the authority of the supernatural Gospel of Jesus Christ. In the present situation, therefore, high churchmen who are also high statesmen will call upon the State not to support the Church of England or even Christianity as such, since that cannot be done sincerely or without misleading, but to acknowledge and make effective its allegiance to the Law of Nature (which the Gospel affirms, though it is not by any means to be identified with, or substituted for, the Gospel).

The least that high statesmen may assert is that the State, as a power ordained by God, whether it be pre-Christian, Christian, or post-Christian, is morally bound to have regard to the Law of Nature. High statesmen must assert this against all who cry down the office of the State or want to confine its regard to temporal or material interests, or who would exempt the State from moral obligation, or who try to work up a belated clamour for *laissez faire* in religion and morals.

On the other hand, high churchmen must assert that it is the office of the Church as a supernatural society independent of, but with a perpetual duty to, the State, to remind the State that if it does not obey the Law of Nature, which is the Law of God, it will surely perish (cp. Isa. lx, 12). In obeying the Law of Nature, the State will be doing, not the most that it can or ought in any circumstances, but the most that it can and ought in these circumstances, to serve as a guardian of the Church's children, and these, let it be remembered, include all the children of this realm, even those who acknowledge neither God nor His Church, and know neither their Father nor their Mother. Just because the power of the State is now so much heightened, and thereby liable to greater abuse, it needs the witness, and when necessary the rebuke and the active opposition, of a strong and independent Church, to keep it true to its high place and office as an ordinance of God for good.

A. R. Vidler.

Hawarden.

Liturgy and Community

All men are pilgrims; by this fact alone we are necessarily related to all our neighbours; were it not so, we might well despair of knitting together the separate strands of human society into a significant, coherent whole. It is, however, equally sure that many do not admit this underlying common bond; and this division of the pilgrims into two groups—one self-conscious and the other blind, the travellers and the wanderers as we might call them, or the believers and the incredulous, to use a more exact term for those who dub themselves agnostic—means that any discussion of a question affecting both groups can follow two distinct paths which may meet but which set out from

widely separated standpoints. This observation is particularly germane to the subject we are reviewing, if only because few questions are liable to such different treatment according to the viewpoint from which they are considered. For this reason, it is difficult, short of a full-length book, to review the relations between Liturgy and Community from both the principal angles from which these relations can be seen; and, in the present essay, the deliberate choice of the point of view of the unbeliever, of the pilgrim who has lost or never really knew his way, is based on a conviction that today at all events it is this viewpoint which needs the more careful consideration.

Few will deny the need of discovering genuinely common ground in a world torn by conflicting doctrines, chaotic with a babel of languages and prone to unending struggles for prizes which cannot in any case be won, a world in which most of the purchasers are demanding goods which are not in fact for sale, and in which the possibility of any common meeting-place recedes with every new effort to create such a centre artificially. It is in this predicament that it is important to remember that, despite the appearances, all men are in fact bent on the same pilgrimage; and further, that the chances of their all realizing that this pilgrimage is one leading to Jerusalem depend largely on those who know this understanding the point of view and state of mind of those who do not. It is precisely this issue which we are facing when we decide to consider the subject of Liturgy and Community; for the true significance of Community is surely that, as we are in fact all going to Jerusalem, we ought really all to go along the road together, with all the reverence and the hilarity of Chaucer's pilgrims going to Canterbury, and above all with that sense of unity of purpose and mutual love and tolerance which only those sharing a journey can ever fully attain; and the corresponding significance of Liturgy is that this journey is made plain, its way lit up, its ultimate end constantly re-emphasised, and its common inner purpose enlivened by that particular form of public worship which Christians have made peculiarly their own. Thus, while from the point of view of the pilgrim who have been granted a vision of the Holy City, the primary emphasis is placed on the discipline necessary to reach it; for those blind pilgrims who have not seen this vision, the first demand of their condition is to be convinced of the unique quest common to all men, which they already intuitively discern, and to feel truly part of that joyous band which not only prays but sings on its way to the City.

To proceed in this task, however, we must shift our ground and consider how these concepts look to those who see them from a different point of view, to whom one of them is most probably meaningless, the other more visionary than soberly descriptive, and the two not remotely connected. The same words do not always mean the same things; and Community is not the least offender in this respect. We must remember that while for the Christian the word has a tradition, a pedigree and a fairly exact meaning, for others it represents rather an aspiration, a brightly coloured hope, more a dream than an experience and better suited to a Platonic heaven than a plebeian earth. Nevertheless, vision though it may be, this term Community is believed by many to answer

very real needs in lives compact of hard experience and intense desires. It is these realities which lie behind the demand for Community which we must investigate; for persuasion, which does not proceed from a point which he, whom we would persuade, recognizes as real and true to his own life is wasted argument. To relate Liturgy and Community, except merely for our own philosophical delight, we must first lay bare the questions to which the popular term is held to be the answer; and only then can we proceed to satisfy those needs more profoundly with a satisfaction truly experienced rather than with hopes too often unfulfilled. That this satisfaction will in a very real sense be found in Community is true enough; but the name is not worth a tithe of its substance: to those who experience it discussion is superfluous, but to those who discuss it its fulfilment is usually denied.

The issues, then, the poignant, personal, sometimes heart-rending issues, which lie behind and foster this vision of Community do not, because they are properly philosophical, fall clearly into logical divisions and cannot, therefore, be treated under exclusively separate headings. For this reason, it is both truer and more convenient to refrain from an exact division of the subject-matter, while suggesting roughly, as we proceed, the broad categories of thought into which it falls.

These questions which we are now going to ask suggest one another and in sum amount to the single demand: What are the factors, the real inner patterns of life and behaviour, of compulsion and reaction, of which a realisation of the popular vision of Community would be at once the perfect expression and the perfect fulfilment? Now, it can only be shown that the way to realize it is very unlike the ways normally pursued, if it can also be made plain that the questions which demand such an answer necessarily of their own intrinsic character call for an answer of a particular kind. In fact, it is not enough for the wanderer to desire to join a band of travellers; he must be persuaded that the object of the pilgrimage is one which must claim his allegiance before he will find any satisfaction at all in becoming one of the band. Community is not a static concept nor an end in itself. It can be defined only dynamically in relation at once to the prior needs which it satisfies and the final purpose which it enables. But this is somewhat to anticipate our argument. Bereft both of any clear knowledge of their own needs and of any adequate estimate of their true destiny, most men's hold on reality is far less secure and their view of it narrowly confined.

At the outset, man is faced by the enigma of his own personal existence; and of whatever else he may be unsure, he is likely, though perhaps with less effort, to reach the famous Cartesian conclusion that he really is. This somewhat alarming predicament is not made markedly more palatable by the reassurances of physical scientists; because a merely evolutionary explanation of the growth of the mind and initiation into the mysteries of sexual reproduction do not in themselves, leaving aside whether these alleged advances in knowledge are in any sense illuminating, make the two principal problems of individual existence any less puzzling. The paradox of the self lies in two facts: that its unity is made up of a society of cells existing in space in

company with a self-conscious mind, apparently non-spatial, but certainly on intimate terms and in a constant relationship with the body; and that this psycho-physical duality has defined limits, isolating it from similar selves. Self-consciousness and loneliness are the two besetting enigmata from which no one is free; and whether we be philosophers or illiterate, whether nurtured in castles or cow-byres, we are compelled to come to terms with these inescapable conundrums. This condition of the individual self might perhaps be called the psychological pattern of existence. It is not an exact definition, but it will serve to distinguish these two irreducible factors of human life from other similar factors which will come to light as we proceed with our survey of man's constitution. At this stage, the point to recognize is that the individual, seen theoretically in isolation, much as he sees himself often enough introspectively, can find no alleviation from these two painful conditions. Indeed, half the philosophies, religious systems and political theories known to history have been attempts to rescue the individual from these bugbears of self-consciousness and loneliness.

The isolation of the individual, however, is one side only of his two-faced nature. From the other he looks out at his fellows, each one a limited whole like himself, but each linked as he is with all the others. This belonging to society, a fact which is part of the data of life, can only be discussed after its acceptance; it cannot possibly be argued away nor finally escaped. At first sight, however, the mere occurrence of society, the coexistence of groups of persons, is encouraging. The most obvious exit from the torture-chamber of the self is to rush quickly on to the battlefield of society. Many people unhesitatingly leap from their personal frying-pans into this general conflagration; but few feel any better for it. The reason for this is that unlike the famous, homely metaphor which we have borrowed, life itself is never subject to such clear-cut distinctions; and all the myriad attempts to suppress or anæsthetize the self, from the interminable trek to Nirvana to the feverish self-immolation of the Nazi man-at-arms, usually lead their devotees to an end more burdensome than their beginning.

Man in society is in fact just that: not society alone nor man alone, but man in society; yet while he does little in this new context to soothe his personal pains, he adds indubitably certain specifically social griefs as little responsive to simple sedatives as those he already possesses. These social problems, however, have for long been the main themes of public, political debate and the subject-matter of the most profound works on political philosophy; they have engaged the attention of persons like Plato and merited the mellifluous prose of Burke and Locke; so that here we need only draw attention briefly to the principal questions to which the lost pilgrim who is the subject of this particular essay still clamours for satisfying answers. The profoundest riddles, which, at the political level, seem to defy solution, are the inescapable facts of inequality among persons and tyrannical government by that power, whether this be exercised by one or many, whether self-appointed or representative, which believes itself to be guardian of the public good. Inequality and tyranny engender the fears which from time immemorial have called forth the cries of freedom and equality.

It is worth remembering, too, that the classical instance of these *cris de cœur* was accompanied by a third demand—*fraternité*—a concept too like our own word community for its use to have been wholly fortuitous.

At this point, we are brought face to face with a perplexing situation, a situation which formally at least is similar to the enigmatic one which we met in our analysis of the self. It seems as though the intrinsic pattern of social relationship involved us in problems which admitted no solution within the limits of that relationship; but on the other hand there is, at first sight, no obvious wider context which can serve society as society served the self, other than that provided by imperial expansion. Man saddled now with four unsatisfied needs, two arising from his inner psychological pattern and two more from his outer social pattern, knows no greater whole in which to immerse himself other than the apparently meaningless void of the universe or the even more horrifying void of death. But he obstinately believes that a resolution can be found. The most reassuring truth which we must remember always of all men is their untiring vision of perfection, expressed in varying forms and changing concepts, but implying always the completion of the broken circle, the resolution of the perplexing paradoxes, the answers to the riddles. The burden of this essay is to suggest that the recent reiteration of *fraternité*, "community," is just such a vision, and that we can only understand its full implications if we try to discover precisely what uncertainties it is expected to remove, what loose ends of life finally to tie. So far, we have discovered four such factors: the fear of the self-conscious, non-spatial mind; the fear of the isolated, lonely individual; the fear of inequality in society; and the fear of the tyranny of government.

There are, however, two more riddles in life, neither wholly divorced from the realms we have already considered nor yet wholly contained in them. To distinguish them from the others, we might call them the riddles of the mystical pattern, because they are deeply hidden in the texture of life and cannot be turned aside by easy answers. These riddles are posed like the others by an intrinsic pattern, an inevitable character, not that of man alone, nor of man in society, but of life itself, of man in the universe. They are the riddles of love and death.

These two ubiquitous constituents of life are, as it were, left over and unaccounted for, when all the purely personal and social questions have been considered. In them man meets realities whose pattern and meaning lie beyond his unaided understanding; nevertheless, he senses that here, if anywhere, he may expect to find answers to all his other intractable problems; but it is only at the unwelcome price of posing riddles far more obscure and tying knots far more difficult to loose. In love, man reaches beyond himself without necessarily risking the specific perplexities of social life; in death, the thirst for equality is finally, coldly assuaged, the fear of the tyrant laid for ever to rest. Yet these very ways out of the dilemma confronting him so often seem to man the roads to Hell, beset by day with devils and by night made grim with uninvited dreams. The plight of those to whom these final riddles of the universe suggest no answer is miserable indeed; for even those whose vision of the perfect community would resolve their every

other doubt find that love and death demand something more to render their deep enigma significant, some fellowship beyond the world of men, some comfort from beyond the farthest star.

Our inquiry has in fact carried us a little farther than a first view of it suggested; for in asking what needs lay behind the demand for community, we find at length that these needs themselves point to two further needs which lie beyond the balm of this particular social medicine. This discovery is all-important, for it enables us to persuade our wandering pilgrim that community in itself is not a final answer, that only a community bound together in a pilgrimage to the proper shrine can possibly fulfil all his needs. Even when mind and body, self and others, rulers and ruled are joined together in one complete, balanced, equal relationship, love and death are still outside this charmed circle; and so long as they are outside it they are likely to break in and bring it all to naught.

Should our wanderer once be persuaded of this central and all-important fact, he will then readily see that only an answer which truly answers the last two riddles will ever as surely answer the first four; and further that such an answer cannot be merely Community.

We must at the same time never forget, as many people are prone to do, that to those who are not observing a circle it is not obvious where the centre is or even that there is a centre at all. Thus, to unite our six riddles into a coherent pattern, to relate the four directly connected with Community with the two which seem to lie beyond it, we must discover, if we can, some quality which they all enjoy in common. This common quality would appear to be what we might tentatively call relationship. Each of the riddles presents in an acute form a problem of seemingly imperfect relationship, a problem precisely because we can envisage its absence. We can see with the eye of vision a perfect marriage of these divorced parts, in which the new whole does not so much answer the preceding questions as render them unnecessary. We can imagine a point where mind and body, self and society, man and his fellow, king and servant, lover and beloved, time and eternity, become mysteriously one. If only, we feel, there were some unassailable guarantee that this was fact as well as vision, if only this dream could for an instant come true, then somehow our present tortures could easily be endured, our spirits be free from the unending doubts of incredulity, our bodies released from the burden of endless drift.

It is not really necessary to complete this picture fully from the other angle or to repeat at length the reply of the Christian pilgrim. Our deliberate choice of the other approach was taken in the knowledge that it was for one thing less well understood and for another a necessary preliminary to any effective missionary action.

We need only add that this side of the grave there is only one place and one event where all the conditions which we have enumerated for answering the supreme riddle of relationship can be found, and found presented in a way intelligible alike to the subtlest philosopher and the simplest child. At the Christian altar, God Himself has answered His own most sphinx-like enigma. There alone the spiritual and the material are met indissolubly together; there alone the worshipper

transcends the petty limits of his own personality and yet preserves it; there alone can be found true equality—the brotherhood of the sonship of the Father; there, too, all are servants of all and all are kings with Christ; finally, only in that supreme Sacrifice is love itself completely manifest, the full outpouring of God's very self for undeserving sinners, and only thus could Love be seen through death and death be swallowed up in victory.

Charles Vereker.

Oxford.

A Modern Miracle Play

There is a mystical quality in the Welsh mind which has often found expression in its music and its poetry. It can also be found distilled into some of its most characteristic drama. Two quite secular plays of Mr Emlyn Williams—*Night Must Fall* and *He Was Born Gay*—displayed it unmistakably; and it is therefore the more surprising that, in a deliberately religious *tour de force* like *The Wind of Heaven*, now being played at the St James's Theatre, this quality has to be coaxed into being. The theme is at once simple and world-shaking—the story of a Welsh village of a hundred years ago into which the expected Messiah is ushered in the form of a peasant boy with healing powers and the ability to produce music from Heaven, and a breath of wind that blows through the house without stirring the curtains. The child dies at last in agony; but we are left in no doubt of the redemptive purpose that his death achieved.

Now all this may be quite impressive—*is*, in fact, impressive. It is handled with dignity and reverence; and, though the play trembles occasionally on the brink of dramatic catastrophe (as when the cock crows three times at dead of night) the threatened disaster never overtakes it. No—and Mr Williams deserves the highest praise for all this; but why does the modern dramatist *gush* so readily when he touches the Gospel story? For it is difficult to imagine anything much more unlike the robust simplicity of Mark or even the supreme artistry of Luke than all this business of music from Heaven without any apparent *raison d'être*, magical winds and a clairvoyant little boy. Perhaps the most outstanding thing about the Bible narrative is the fact that such incidents as the angels at Bethlehem and the wind of Pentecost are almost taken in its stride—that we come upon them unawares and they are gone in a flash—leaving us with an unforgettable picture; but Mr Williams builds up these things into crises that leave behind them a sense of having been mere "trimmings"—and rather inconsequential trimmings at that. Nor is it likely that anyone coming fresh to the Gospel story in the twentieth century, and reading it for the first time, would describe it as "a lovely story." He or she (as it happens to be) is just as likely to regard it as quite horrible.

This tendency of a play which narrowly misses greatness is worth elaborating because it is a tendency that dogs a great deal of modern religious fiction and dramatic literature and threatens to wreck a religious theme almost every time it appears on the screen. It is part of a

determination to reduce the Christian story to the dimensions of a modern Christmas carol—gives us tenderness and a rather sentimental beauty, but carefully avoids all allusion to blood and sweat and horror and Hell. It is true that Mr Emlyn Williams' little Messiah dies in agony of cholera; but it is not without significance that he does so "off stage," and that we never come to really close quarters with him, so that his death, which should be a mighty tragedy, is one of the least poignant episodes of the play. There is, in fact, throughout, a sense of mighty things going on in the background which does credit to the skill of the quite first-rate team of players that Mr Williams has got together; but the foreground is just not big enough dramatically to create the final illusion which he is at so much pains to bring to life.

There are some remarkable individual performances. That of the circus manager who attempts to prick the bubble of this village wonder by capturing the boy as his own "star turn" (a most engaging rascal) is played with admirable gusto by Mr Williams himself; and the dramatic story of his conversion brings into play all those subtle lights and shades of his technique that have made him one of our foremost actors. Miss Diana Wynyard as the frustrated war widow who is his fellow-convert is a clever study of a woman who might be a genuine mystic or possibly a case of "psychological compensation." Mr Herbert Lomax, as a kind of Welsh Isaiah, does not get enough elbow room for those fiery gifts of which he gave such glowing evidence in *The Glorious Morning*. The most outstanding performance, however, was that of Miss Barbara Cowper as the jealous mistress of the successful circus manager who tried to reclaim him from his new-found life of dedication. It is a masterpiece of craven jealousy and selfish ambition masquerading as love—a part and a performance with positively apocalyptic significance. It is impossible not to be moved by this play; but one ought to have been shattered. Frankly, one was not.

London. Ashley Sampson.

Educational Books

Two books, both written from the undenominational standpoint, deal with the consequences of the Education Act. *Willingly to School*, by John Newsom (S.C.M. Press, 2s. 6d.), relates education to its sociological setting and the claims of a child's personality in the terms of Christian idealism. Professor A. Victor Murray in *The School and the Church* (S.C.M. Press, 3s. 6d.) maintains that education, if pursued far enough, will take us into the "realm of religion," even though "Religion has to do with God and education has to do with us." This dualism inevitably limits the vocation of the Church to the provision of a fellowship for those whose education has afforded a religious philosophy. Those who regard the Church as a starting-point may find themselves impatient towards an argument that treats it as a most desirable adjunct. None the less the argument should be studied and weighed, since this would seem to be the assumption of the agreed-

syllabus religion on which Church and State have come to terms for the time being.

Two excellent books provide material for teachers. The publishers are justified in describing as "a novelty among books on a well-worn subject" Mr Basil Clarke's *Clement joins the Church* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). In twenty-three lessons Mr Clarke teaches the substance of the Catechism through the story of a boy who lived the Christian life in the fourth century. The whole thing is extremely well done against a background of that good scholarship which lesson-books do not always instance. In Part VI of *Haggerston Catechism* (Mowbrays, 1s. 9d.) Fr H. A. Wilson gives twenty-six lessons on "The Greater Sacraments." The conclusion of the series comes as a reminder of the great thing that he has done for teachers. He has shown that the Catechism need not be shunned as an outmoded piece of repetition work. It is something that children can live, as well as learn, if the lessons are framed in the loving and pastoral context of this series.

Two further books provide useful simplifications for teachers who are not theologians. They might also well be used in parish church libraries. The late Deaconess Dorothy Batho, in *The Birth of Judaism* (S.P.C.K., 5s.), has left us an expansion of notes used for School Certificate pupils. Dr L. E. Elliott-Binns, in *The Story of England's Church* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), has given a much-needed outline of English Church history.

The conductor of a short educational survey may perhaps be allowed licence to turn from the books received to those unpublished. Religious education plainly waits for the sacrifices of scholarship, engaged in breaking new ground. Liturgy has attracted the scholars, and their work is shaping the future. When, for instance, will other scholars give the same diligence to the catechetical documents of the early Church and the sixteenth century? They will alter the shape of religious education when they do.

Reginald Lumb.

Chislehurst.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Bible, the Church and South India. The proposed Scheme of Church Union in South India considered in the light of scriptural and historical principles, with some positive proposals for its modification. By Trevor Jalland. Dacre Press. 5s.

This book is not written in an easy style, but it stands out amongst the controversial writings upon its subject by reason of its scholarship, its fulness of information, and its blending of a constructive with a critical temper. Its significance lies in the way in which it indicates that the discussion is passing into a new phase. At an earlier stage it was the treatment of the Ministry and of Confirmation which aroused the gravest disquiet, but since the text of the seventh edition of the Scheme has been studied in England it has become specially apparent that the unsatisfactory features of the Scheme have their roots in confused think-

ing about some of the fundamentals of theology, such as the place and authority of Scripture, the Church, and the Creeds. The claim that the Scheme accepts the Creeds as symbols of the faith lacks reality when it is found that the use of a Creed is required neither in Baptism nor in public worship; and a conception of the relation of the Scriptures and the Church as novel as it is obscure is found in the sentence "the Church must always be ready to correct and reform itself in accordance with the teaching of those Scriptures as the Holy Spirit shall reveal it." It seems to me that the real danger at the end of the interim period may be not a Church with defective orders but a Church with an utterly confused position as regard the authority and use of Creeds; for so great is the contradiction involved in the initial doctrine that it is hard to see how the new Church will get rid of it. Then the greatest difficulty may arise as to the relation between South India and the Anglican Communion. For while we can readily determine our relation to a Church which uses the Creeds or to a Church which does not use them, how will there be unity and intercommunion with a Church that accepts them in theory but requires their use on *none* of the occasions with which their use in historic Christendom is bound up?

Dr Jalland's own constructive suggestion is that a united Church in South India should be set up consisting only of the non-Anglican elements, that it should organize itself as far as possible on the lines of the Scheme, and that when it had a sufficient approximation to the essentials needed for unity the Indian bishops should give consecration to its (hitherto unconsecrated) bishops with a view to a gradual extension of the historic orders throughout it. By this method no communicants of the Anglican Communion would be asked to enter an interim Church of ambiguous faith and order, and the extent of our unity with the new South Indian Church would advance *pari passu* with its clear and unambiguous reception of the historic Creeds and orders. Let us hope that this suggestion will have wide publicity in view of future plans for reunion, and that it will be so developed as to avoid a semblance of onesidedness and to ensure the incorporation of the positive treasures of Free Church religion within the framework of the historic order.

Dr Jalland provides us very fully with the material for comparing the root theological ideas of the Scheme, with those of the primitive Church and this is perhaps the most valuable part of the book. He also gives a searching criticism of Dr Hodgson's *Anglicanism and South India*. It is likely that many readers were puzzled by Dr Hodgson's plea for the recognition of the "equality" of all ministries in a divided Christendom, despite his earlier plea that the Apostolic Succession is the divinely given order for the universal Church. "Equality in what?" one asks. For may there not be equality in good intention, equality in spiritual efficiency, equality in the justification of moral motives before God—and yet *not* equality in the nature of the commission which is held and in the authority of that commission in its relation to the universal Church? And is it not a pity to encourage a use of the phrase "equality of ministries" which concentrates upon the former sort of equality and diverts consideration from the latter?

But I differ from Dr Jalland in thinking that he (like the Superiors of Religious Communities in their open letter) makes too big a demand on doctrinal definition as a preliminary to steps towards unity. For I expect that the movement of a separated community of Christians into the apprehension of the meaning of what it has lacked must be a gradual process rather than a matter of "take it all or leave it all." This means "growing together," and it may involve that in *some* matters agreement is at the outset incomplete. But there are matters wherein initial agreement is quite essential; and the distressing thing about South India is the presence in the Scheme of something distinct alike from agreement and from agreement to differ—namely, a woolly ambiguity and self-contradiction about the foundations of belief. The treatment of the Creeds gives a shudder to many who are now able to contrast the text of the Scheme with the repeated assertion that the Scheme "accepts the Creeds." It is here that the most significant alterations of the Scheme since 1930 were made, it is here that the neglect of the Church at home to give warning is most to be regretted. It is not that the process of "growing together" is wrong, but that if the process is rooted in ambiguities it makes a fair bid to create more schism than it heals.

A. M. Ramsey.

Durham.

The Way of At-one-ment. By W. J. Phythian-Adams. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

The Unquenchable Light. By K. S. Latourette. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 7s. 6d.

World Church. By John Foster. S.C.M. 6s.

Canon Phythian-Adams gives as a sub-title to this essay "Studies in Biblical Theology," and his previous books encourage the reader to expect much; nor is he disappointed. The book is offered to all those who are working for Reunion. Beginning with a chapter on the pattern of sacred history, we are warned not to regard the use of Old Testament terms in the New Testament as so much analogy or metaphor, but rather as a "vital correspondence" which is dubbed rather awkwardly "homology." The chapter ends with an interesting summary of the faith of an Israelite in the palmy days of Solomon, that of an Israelite during the Exile and the faith of the New Israel. After going on to consider "The Royal Priesthood" we are asked to accept the fact that Biblical Theology is in eclipse. Catholics think in terms of salvation through the Sacraments within the ark of the Church at the hands of a valid ministry; Protestants maintain that salvation is won through the study and hearing of the word, so awakening faith. In both cases the goal is Eternal Life or Immortality. In contrast is the scheme of rebirth into the risen Israel of God and consecration into its Royal Priesthood, a Holy Community of Love. The goal is At-one-ment with God in Christ. The Church has forgotten that it *is* Israel and hence the decline into pietism. We are then asked to look at Biblical Theology in Practice, at the Ministry in the New Testament, the beginnings of Sacerdotalism, and a chapter follows on the Ministry not as an instrument but as an agent of the Divine Atoning Process gathering all into one. This

is impressively and valuably worked out. The book ends with a suggestive chapter on the Ministry in the United Church.

It is a pity that the writer is so pessimistic about the possibilities of reunion with the Catholic West or the Orthodox that he confines his attention to reunion with Free Churchmen at home; but his intention is eirenic and constructive, his original treatment of the chapter thought-provoking, and though controversial this book may help many to discover a new approach to the discovery of the Universal Israel, the Church of God. One regrets that such a useful book is marred by an obscure and slightly pompous style.

The two other books direct our thoughts not to a theory of the Church but to the practice of the Church as a missionary body. Professor Latourette, described by the publishers as Christianity's greatest living historian, provides us with an interesting gloss on his study of the Church's expansion. There seems to have been a pattern of ebb and flow. First an initial advance up to A.D. 500, then the first and greatest recession up to 950, then a great age of advance up to 1350, a further recession to 1500, the third great advance from 1500 to 1750, another recession till 1815, and the last great advance up to 1914, bringing us to the latest age. Is this another major recession?

John Foster in his *World Church* makes use of this thesis to some extent, but is concerned to demonstrate that the Church has always been worldwide, and gives historical examples of a fascinating kind of interpenetration not generally known. The account of the Nestorian mission in Central Asia, and the many "ifs" of history which this sensitive historian suggests to our minds, are strangely compelling. If Western Christendom had been able to send good missionaries to Kublai Khan, Islamic India might today have been Christian and a very different story have been told. Fascinating also is the story of King Edward I of England receiving communion from the hands of an Eastern monk from Peking. It is good for us to realise the interdependence of Christians within the Una Sancta. This is a most stimulating essay in Church history, and one which all concerned with the worldwide mission of the Church might well read with great care. Both these books demonstrate that history can be a cordial for drooping spirits as well as a judgment.

L. M. Schiff.

Spennymoor.

Three Russian Prophets. By Nicholas Zernov. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

The Churches in the U.S.S.R. By Stanley Evans. Cobbett Publishing Co. 5s.

If anything is clear about Russia, it is that we must repudiate the tutelage of the Western Marxists if we are to begin to understand it. For Marxism, like Roman Catholicism and Liberalism, is so essentially a Western phenomenon that it necessarily begs most of the questions we shall want to ask. Dr Zernov's book on three nineteenth-century Russian prophets, Alexei Khomiakov, Feodor Dostoevsky, and Vladimir Soloviev, is just the sort of book a man should read who wishes to introduce himself to the fascinating enigma of modern Russian civilization. The book is no profound study: it takes little for

granted. The author, himself Russian and vividly aware of the differences between East and West, is concerned simply to expound the ideas of his three thinkers in their essential Russian-ness and in organic relation with the salient points of Russian history and culture. The author has a gift for such exposition, the secret of which is the sincerity and enthusiasm of his own mind.

This brings us to the most obvious feature of the book, the fact that we are listening to a Slavophil on the Slavophils. Dr Zernov's sympathy with the doctrines of his prophets, with their idea of the unique and decisive mission of Russia, is more than imaginative. He himself upholds the view that Orthodox Christianity in the special circumstances of the geography and history of Russia has a message for the world which alone can save it, and he adduces the truth, now vindicated, of the prophecies respecting the course of Western civilization uttered by the three astonishing men he describes to help clinch the argument. The root of the contention is the belief that the Orthodox Church is the nearest to the original potency of the Faith, and that the fact is demonstrable by reference to the history of the Russian people. The West went astray into authoritarianism and later, and by reaction, into individualism and rationalism, whereas the Russian East kept much closer to the true idea and practice of community. The argument raises all sorts of queries in the mind, above all, perhaps, a query regarding the extent to which we have here some confusion between the actual and the ideal. However, if we remember that Dr Zernov is himself a Russian prophet, his book can be read with profit as well as pleasure. There is a useful bibliography, to which must now be added Soloviev's *The Meaning of Love*, just published in English by G. Bles. There seems to be a serious misprint in the 12th line of page 95.

Mr Stanley Evans's book is very different. The author is a friend of Russia, but he writes from just such a thoroughly Western point of view to which *Three Russian Prophets* is so good a corrective. Unlike Dr Zernov, he is friendly to the present Russian government, and he would probably disagree with him about the position of the Church in Russia today and also under the Czars. Here he, in his turn, may be something of a corrective to Dr Zernov. The Soviet government has not persecuted and does not, he says, persecute religion. He has much to say on this matter and has transcribed many interesting documents. Whether he be right or wrong, the book is a gesture of friendship rather than a critical study.

B. H. G. Wormald.

Cambridge.

The Obedience of a Christian Man. By Edgar P. Dickie. S.C.M. 6s.

Those Things which cannot be Shaken. By Maisie Spens. Hodder and Stoughton. 7s. 6d.

The Struggle of the Dutch Church. By W. A. Visser 't Hooft. S.C.M. 2s. 6d.

The Obedience of a Christian Man suggests that here is something aimed straight at believers: alas, we find jottings on the nature and

destiny of man. The theologically well-read will find it slight and the less well-read, for whom we imagine it is written, may well be bewildered after being thrust into the oranges and lemons of controversy and breathlessly advised by the author on which side to line up.

Canon E. A. Abbott and Mr E. I. Watkin, in forewords, commend *Those Things which cannot be Shaken*, a collection of articles with the twin themes of prayer in the Body of Christ and the value of silence. The underlying oneness of all crises, individual and social, is well brought out, but the edge of Miss Spens's word is blunted because she moves over the general spiritual meaning of those things which are now being shaken instead of narrowing down as do great spiritual writers to the direction of individual souls, or speaking out of personal religious experience or in preaching to a congregation or community whose members are known to the speaker.

It is speaking out of an experienced situation which gives power to the documents collected and edited by Dr Visser 't Hooft in *The Struggle of the Dutch Church for the Maintenance of the Commandments of God in the Life of the State*. This reviewer is most grateful that the book came his way, and he draws attention especially to pp. 61 *ff.*, "The Pastoral about National-Socialist Philosophy," which corroborates much that Miss Amy Buller had to say in *Darkness over Germany*, and also to pp. 58 *ff.*, "Directions for Ecclesiastical Discussion," and pp. 78 *ff.*, "An Unofficial Confession of Faith" for those interested in the "What is Anglicanism?" discussion going on in THEOLOGY. There is a certain ambiguity in the Dutch Church's attitude to the occupying power as to whether or no its rule is "lawful" (in the biblical sense). On p. 73 "an authority which rules in accordance with National-Socialist principles of civil order can therefore not be recognized as 'a minister of God to thee [*i.e.*, to the Church] for good.'" On p. 84 "we believe that the authorities, too, owe obedience to Him, and that therefore in certain cases obedience to Christ may mean for the subject disobedience to the authorities." *Per contra* on p. 25, in the form of the prayer for the distress of Christendom, prayer is made "for the occupying powers whom Thou hast permitted to rule over us." On p. 84 "The great cause of 'Law' in the life of the community is upheld by the authorities set over us, and we do not help them by unrestrained and wild utterances of hatred and revenge." There is a lack of guidance to those faced with the problem of conscience arising from the formation of underground resistance groups. The Church can hardly treat the civil power as if it is lawful and at the same time seek its overthrow by violence as if it were a tyranny. What we Christians sorely need today are some criteria for judging political means. We are beginning to arrive again at a formulation of the State and the ends of this-world association, but how hard it is to bring out of any situation, tangled by sin, political methods which compromise tolerably the absolute ethical demands of the world to come.

M. P. RALPH-BOWMAN.

ASHBRITTLE.

IN OUR TONGUES. Edited by J. P. Stevenson. S.P.C.K. 5s.

This collection of sermons and addresses given by a great variety of preachers makes a great claim for itself by the title of the book. Here, we are told, is the language which is understood by the people, here are the preachers who are able to put across "the timeless Truth" to our age. It is doubtful whether it is true that the material of these sermons would all readily be understood by the multitudes who heard them; it is even more doubtful how far they have succeeded in setting forth the profound realities of "the timeless Truth." It is true that most of these sermons approach their subject in an apologetic manner—that is to say, they search for something in the minds, hearts and experience of the hearers to which they attempt to add some particular element of Christian morals or faith in order to drive home a lesson. In the judgment of the reviewer the former work of making contact with their hearers is more successful than the amount and body of Christian Truth that is mediated. In fact in some cases the introduction of the Christian message appears remote, *thin* and altogether inadequate to the Reality concerned. It is as though the preachers were afraid to preach the Word. So keen are they to be understood that the end of this aim falls flat. We are reminded of St Paul in Athens and St Paul in Corinth. Why this hesitation to proclaim the Gospel? Why must it all be in terms of what once was called "what Jones will swallow"? The interspersing of the Gospel message with continual appeal to terms, ideas, words of our common daily life (in these particular sermons, the background and outlook of the Services) does not necessarily reveal the uniqueness of the Gospel claim and word. The root common facts of our daily life have already been enshrined in the very Gospel teaching itself. Therein lies its perennial and universal attraction. It is doubtful whether it is necessary to characterize the Body of Christ, the Church, as the First Army of the Young King, in order to proclaim the Church. No doubt this would readily be agreed to; but the important point is how far the unique claims of the Christian religion are in danger of being lost under this perpetual searching for other words. How frequently also many sermons are unbiblical: the themes could have been treated with many most apt passages of Holy Scripture, the straightforward exegesis of which will do more to help modern difficulties than the perpetual insistence on analysing all the difficulties. The Bishop of Norwich in the preface calls attention to a changed attitude towards the Church in the last war and this; *then* the Church was on trial, *now* interest in religion is everywhere manifest. It would equally be true to say that *then* men sadly complained "the Church has failed," *now* they are not interested even in its failure. Without wishing to appear obscurantist, those who take the preaching office seriously will learn more from Newman, Liddon, Robertson or Spurgeon than from many modern collections of sermons.

CYRIL GARDNER.

WANTAGE.

SHORTER NOTICES

LANFRANC: A STUDY OF HIS LIFE, WORK AND WRITING. By A. J. Macdonald. Second Edition. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The period of the Norman Conquest presents a conspicuous example of the dominance a small star-cluster of outstanding personalities can exert over an age of transition. Under William I and Lanfranc the Church of the Anglo-Saxons was bonded, without great struggle, into the Norman scheme: the work of Columba, Augustine, Theodore and Dunstan was at once crowned for what it had been, and given that new, invigorating discipline of form and life which made it what it was to become. Hence the importance of Dr. Macdonald's study: it tells how Lanfranc dealt with the Church he found; it describes the spring of that triangle of tension, Church, King and Pope, which was to make the history of the next five hundred years.

The book is a new edition, by the S.P.C.K., of a work published in 1926 by the Oxford University Press; it now carries a fourth appendix, also a reprint, in support of the author's contention that the privileges quoted by Eadmer as the ground of Canterbury's claim to the primacy in 1120 were not those used by Lanfranc in 1072, but were forged for the occasion by the monks of Canterbury, possibly by Eadmer himself, by whom also Lanfranc's originals were destroyed. Lanfranc is thus acquitted of the forgery. This treatment of the York controversy is thorough and scholarly in the extreme; the author's conclusions have been assailed by Frau M. Dueball, but approved by Professor H. W. C. Davis and Dr Z. N. Brooke (*English Historical Review*, xli. 627; xlv. 149). Readers inexpert in diplomatics will not find the argument easy to follow. Elsewhere, while this standard of scholarship is maintained, the interest is wider, ranging over Lanfranc's work as lawyer, theologian, abbot, statesman and archbishop. The revival of councils, the reform of monastic and diocesan life, the building of churches, the tightening of discipline, the defence of temporalities, the passing of letters to and from old friends and masters—these were the daily occupations of a man who was also the chief servant of an exacting king, his vice-gerent while absent from the realm, his advocate at the court of Rome and his trusted foil against it. Students will be glad to be reminded of Dr Macdonald's study of such a fruitful life. Specialists may be referred for criticism to the two reviews of the first edition quoted above and to the *Times Literary Supplement* of March 18, 1926.

G. R. DUNSTAN.

HUDDERSFIELD.

THE MEANING OF LOVE. By Vladimir Solovyev, translated from the Russian by Janet Marshall. Geoffrey Bles. 5s.

This translation of one of the most famous treatises produced by Russian mystical philosophy is an invaluable addition to the material available to English scholars. As the publishers note upon the dust-jacket, this book has been acclaimed by Berdyaev, whose works we do

know, as the best treatment of its subject and one of the most remarkable of Solovyev's writings. It would have been a great help to most of us if there had been a few lines of Introduction, telling us a little more about the book, and in particular its date and literary connexions, and a little about its author too. For the rest we owe a debt of gratitude to the translator, who has tackled a very difficult problem with courage and for the most part with success. She has not always escaped from "translation English" in the effort to be faithful to the original, and this makes the book impossible to read with fluency. Thus I cannot, even upon reflection, discover the reference of "them" and "here" in p. 27, l. 28; the punctuation of p. 7, ll. 23-28, and of p. 18, l. 10, reduces those passages to chaos; and it takes very hard work to see what is meant by the terms used in such a sentence as "for a rational intelligence there will never fail to be an assignable inert substance to account for factors of a directly-contradictory character; one which will never fail to bring attraction to extension, to extract tendency and impulse from impenetrability—to understand them as inertia" (pp. 73-4). Without a knowledge of Russian I can only guess at the difficulties the translator had to face before such a sentence was achieved! But even that is better than a translation which obscures Solovyev in smooth English phrases. For the book is worth close reading, and the effort of attention will be well repaid.

L. W. Grensted.

Oxford.

Seed-Time and Harvest. By F. C. Hamlyn, with an Introduction by the Bishop of Ely. S.P.C.K. 8d.

Unlike *The Church and the Land*, which it in no way replaces, this collection of prayers abounds in responses and can only be fully used by people having copies. It might well be distributed among farmers and landworkers and used with them at the varying stages of the year's work. Only thus can its value be proved. The prayers, many of which are happily drawn from Anglican sources, might with the Bishop's sanction be said within the framework of the Occasional Prayers. Any attempt to restore the broken union between the Church and the Land is to be welcomed.

F. R. Bolton.

East Markham.

The World's Question and the Christian Answer. By A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Bishop of Derby. Longmans. 4s. 6d.

The Bishop of Derby here publishes his 1944 visitation charge together with some addresses, some appendices on matters of diocesan concern, and a charge to churchwardens delivered by the chancellor of the diocese of Derby. The visitation charge is an exposition of the "essential core" of Christianity, the doctrine of God, sin, and redemption to eternal life. The addresses are on the Creed, on Christian unity (one of them to a Free Church audience), and on Sunday observance.

The Bishop is a skilled exponent of theological ideas and this little

book effectively presents an outline of that liberal orthodoxy of which he has been a prominent teacher for many years. It might prove of service as a book for discussion groups.

H. BALMFORTH.

ELY.

YOURS IN THE FIGHT. By M. C. Hale and M. S. Cave. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This tribute to Prebendary Carlile of the Church Army by two of his nieces reveals the pugnacious religious character of the man. How true he is to a particular religious type! downright, self-sacrificing—restless in his search for souls. Personal, particular—odd. Yet no one can read it without feeling the genuineness and whole-hearted devotion of a true man of God.

PSALM CXIX. By A. Dru Drury, C.R. C.L.A. 1s.

Members of religious orders recite this psalm daily. To many at times it seems it must be a rather monotonous form of devotion. At other times, say during Retreat, verses leap up from the text with new meaning and one dimly understands what daily food of such excellent order is this. Father A. Dru Drury, C.R., has written a most excellent short devotional commentary on this Psalm, clear, moving, intelligent, and in its measure scholarly. We thoroughly recommend it in every way.

CYRIL GARDNER.

WANTAGE.

CORRESPONDENCE

SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In his paper on "Sunday Morning Service" your contributor X suggests a certain way of shortening Matins to make it the Old Testament introduction to the Eucharist. It may interest your readers who do not know it that this arrangement is authorized in the 1928 revision of the Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. In the summer of 1929 I regularly conducted service precisely as suggested by X while in charge of the church at Essex, N.Y., and can testify from experience that what he recommends is as satisfactory in practice as in theory.

Yours, etc.,

LEONARD HODGSON.

CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD.
June 12, 1945.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher